

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-22, 24-30, 32-38, 41-46, and 48-78 are pending, of which claims 6-7, 10-11, 19, 21-22, 30, 38, 46, 51, 53, 60, 68, and 75 have been amended. The amendments to claims 6-7, 10-11, 19, 21-22, 30, 38, 46, 51, 53, 60, 68, and 75 are simply to provide clarification and/or to correct informalities noted by the Applicant, and are not to overcome prior art.

Claim Objections under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c)

Claims 11, 20, and 32 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form (*Office Action* p.2). Claim 11 has been rewritten in independent form. Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 20 and 32 are of a proper dependent form.

Claim 20 recites "A telecommunications system comprising the collect callback system as recited in claim 12". In similar form, Claim 32 recites "A telecommunications system comprising the collect callback system as recited in claim 24".

The only requirements detailed in 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) that are applicable to the form of claims 20 and 32 are that a claim "may be presented in dependent form, referring back to and further limiting another claim or claims in the same application", and that "[c]laims in dependent form shall be construed to include all the limitations of the claim incorporated by reference into the dependent claim." (*also* MPEM 608.01(n)). Further, "there is no set statutory form for claims" (MPEP 608.01(m)).

1 Claims 20 and 32 clearly meet the requirements of "referring back to and
2 further limiting another claim or claims in the same application", and can "be
3 construed to include all the limitations of the claim incorporated by reference into
4 the dependent claim", as set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c). Accordingly, claims 20
5 and 32 are in an acceptable dependent form and are in condition for allowance.
6 Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claims 20 and 32 be
7 withdrawn.

8
9 **35 U.S.C. §102 Claim Rejections**

10 Claims 1-3, 5-7, 11, 21, 41, 52, 57, 59-64, 66-71, and 73-77 are rejected
11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,775,365 to
12 Norby (hereinafter, "Norby") (*Office Action* p.2). Applicant respectfully traverses
13 the rejection.

14 Claim 1 recites a collect callback system, comprising:

15 a call-in service configured to establish a communication link with a
16 call source, the call-in service further configured to initiate a collect
17 callback option for the call source; and

18 a switch configured to receive callback data from the call-in service,
19 the switch further configured to establish a collect call via a second
20 communication link between the call source and the call-in service.

21 Norby does not show or disclose the combination of elements as recited in
22 claim 1, and the configuration and description of the components in Norby does
23 not substantiate the §102 rejection of claim 1. The Office cites Norby Fig.1 and
24 col.4, lines 5-38 to reject claim 1 (*Office Action* pp. 2-3).
25

1 Considering the first element of claim 1, and the Office's cites to Norby,
2 the Office apparently refers to the first party (at 12) in Norby as the claimed call
3 source, and refers to the second party terminal device (20) in Norby as the claimed
4 call-in service (*Norby* col.4, lines 10-20). Considering the second element of
5 claim 1, and the Office's cites to Norby, the Office apparently refers to the
6 interexchange carrier switch (14) in Norby as the claimed switch.

7 Norby describes that the first party (at 12) initiates a call that is routed to
8 the second party terminal device (20). Upon receiving a busy signal or no answer
9 at terminal device (20), the caller (e.g., first party) may elect to allow or approve a
10 directed return call (*Norby* col.4, lines 10-22). A call detail record (22) is created
11 at the caller's interexchange carrier switch (14) (*Norby* col.4, lines 25-26 and
12 col.5, lines 6-8 referring to block 60 in Fig.2). The second party terminal
13 device (20) is then provided a dial back signaling message from the first party
14 interexchange carrier switch (14) (*Norby* col.5, lines 13-15).

15
16 **A. Norby does not establish a communication link with a call source**
17 **and then initiate a collect callback option for the call source.**

18 Claim 1 recites that the call-in service is configured to establish a
19 communication link with a call source whereupon the call-in service then initiates
20 a collect callback option for the call source. To the contrary, Norby does not show
21 or disclose that a communication link is established with a call source after which
22 a collect callback option is initiated. Rather, Norby describes that "upon receiving
23 a busy signal or no answer at terminal device (20), the first caller may elect to
24 allow a directed return call" (*Norby* col.4, lines 17-19). There is no
25

1 communication link established between a call source and a call-in service in
2 Norby to then initiate a collect callback option for the call source, as recited in
3 claim 1.

4 Accordingly, Norby does not show or disclose each and every element of
5 claim 1 as would be required to substantiate the §102 rejection. As such, claim 1
6 is allowable over Norby for at least this reason and claim 1 should be allowed.

7
8 **B. Norby does not show that a switch (at the first party) establishes**
9 **a collect call between a call source and a call-in service.**

10 Claim 1 recites that the switch is further configured to establish a collect
11 call between the call source and the call-in service. To the contrary, Norby
12 describes that the second party terminal device (20) is provided with a dial-back
13 signaling message via which the second party (e.g., the called party) can initiate
14 the directed call return (Norby col.5, lines 13-15; lines 47-52). As described
15 above, the Office refers to the interexchange carrier switch (14) in Norby as the
16 claimed switch. However, it is not the interexchange carrier switch (14) in Norby
17 from which the second party initiates the directed call return, but rather from the
18 second party terminal device (20).

19 Accordingly, Norby does not show or disclose the combination of elements
20 and/or features as recited in claim 1. As such, claim 1 is also allowable over
21 Norby for at least this reason and claim 1 should be allowed.
22
23
24
25

C. Norby does not show a switch that receives collect callback data from a call-in service.

Claim 1 recites a switch configured to receive callback data from the call-in service. To the contrary, Norby describes that the second party terminal device (20) is provided a dial back signaling message from the first party interexchange carrier switch (14) (Norby col.5, lines 13-15). As described above, the Office refers to the second party terminal device (20) in Norby as the claimed call-in service, and refers to the interexchange carrier switch (14) in Norby as the claimed switch. Concluding from the description in Norby and the basis for the rejection, it would be the "call-in service" that receives the dial back data from the "switch". This is in opposite to "a switch configured to receive callback data from the call-in service", as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Norby describes a dissimilar system and does not show or disclose the combination of elements and/or features as recited in claim 1. As such, claim 1 is also allowable over Norby for at least this reason and claim 1 should be allowed.

D. Norby requires the specific functionality of intelligent terminal devices at each end of a communication, and one each per caller.

Claim 1 recites a call-in service that is configured to initiate a collect callback option for a call source, and a switch that is configured to establish a collect call between the call source and the call-in service. The call source does not require an intelligent terminal device (as described in Norby) to simply (1) place a call to the call-in service which then establishes a communication link

1 with the call source, and (2) answer a call from the switch that establishes a collect
2 call between the call source and the call-in service.

3 Norby requires the specific functionality of intelligent terminal devices for
4 each caller at each end of a call to facilitate allowing a second person to return a
5 call from a first person and indicate to the second person that the first person will
6 pay for the call. Accordingly, Norby describes a dissimilar system and does not
7 show or disclose the combination of elements and/or features as recited in claim 1.
8 As such, claim 1 is also allowable over Norby for at least this reason and claim 1
9 should be allowed.

10 Additionally, Norby is entirely dependent on a second person (e.g., a
11 second party, or the called party) initiating a directed return call to the first person,
12 or caller, that will pay for the call. To the contrary, Applicant claims that a
13 communication link is established between a call source and a call-in service that
14 initiates a collect callback option for the call source, and a switch then establishes
15 a collect call between the call source and the call-in service without input from a
16 second person or entity, as required in Norby.

17 Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Norby for at least any one of the
18 many reasons described above, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102
19 rejection be withdrawn.

20
21 Claims 2-3 and 5-7 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon
22 claim 1. Additionally, some or all of claims 2-3 and 5-7 are allowable over Norby
23 for independent reasons. For example:
24
25

1 Claim 3 recites that "the switch is further configured to notify the call-in
2 service that the collect call for the call source is authorized". Norby does not show
3 or disclose that a switch notifies a call-in service that a collect call for a call source
4 is authorized.

5 As described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1, the Office
6 refers to the second party terminal device (20) in Norby as the claimed call-in
7 service, and refers to the interexchange carrier switch (14) in Norby as the claimed
8 switch. However, the interexchange carrier switch (14) in Norby does not notify
9 the second party terminal device (20) that a directed call return is authorized.

10 Rather, Norby describes that the initiating service (16) at the calling party
11 submits information to the calling party interexchange carrier switch (14) to
12 indicate that called party has been authorized to place a call back to the calling
13 party (*Norby* col.4, line 66 to col.5, line 4 as cited by the Office). Norby does not
14 show or disclose that a switch notifies a call-in service that a collect call for a call
15 source is authorized, as recited in claim 3.

16 Accordingly, claim 3 is allowable over Norby and the §102 rejection should
17 be withdrawn.

18
19 Claim 5 recites an access code that corresponds to the call-in service, and
20 that the switch is configured to receive a call source identifier and obtain the
21 access code associated with the call-in service identifier from the database. Norby
22 does not show or disclose any such access code in addition to a call-in service
23 identifier and a call source identifier, as recited in claim 5.
24
25

1 The Office cites to col.5, lines 14-25 of Norby which describes that the
2 dial-back signaling message at the intelligent terminal device of the called party
3 includes the calling party's telephone number and a casual dialing code for the
4 calling party's interexchange carrier. Norby only describes a calling party's
5 telephone number and a casual dialing code, whereas Applicant recites a call
6 source identifier, a call-in service identifier, *and* an access code.

7 Accordingly, claim 5 is allowable over Norby and the §102 rejection should
8 be withdrawn.

9
10 Claim 6 recites that "the switch is further configured to obtain the call
11 source data from the database and utilize the call source data to authorize the
12 collect call for the call source." Norby does not show or disclose that a switch
13 obtains call source data and then utilizes the call source data to authorize a collect
14 call for a call source, as recited in claim 6. Further, Norby does not include call
15 source data, as recited in claim 6.

16 The Office cites to col.5, lines 56-64 of Norby which only describes billing
17 records as call detail records. There is nothing in Norby to indicate that call detail
18 records are call source data utilized to authorize a collect call for a call source, as
19 recited in claim 6.

20 Accordingly, claim 6 is allowable over Norby and the §102 rejection should
21 be withdrawn.

22
23 Claim 7 recites "call source data including call limits for the call source",
24 "call limit standards that identify at least one of a day limit, a week limit, or a
25

1 month limit", and that "the switch is further configured to obtain the call source
2 data from the database and authorize the collect call for the call source if the call
3 limits for the call source do not exceed the call limit standards."

4 Norby does not show or disclose any of the features recited in claim 7. The
5 Office cites to col.4, lines 59-65 and to col.5, lines 27-40 of Norby which only
6 refers to a time interval that can be established by the calling party, and which
7 designates a duration during which the directed call return service will be available
8 for use by the called party. The time interval in Norby is for the called party – not
9 for the call source as recited in claim 7. Further, nothing about the time interval in
10 Norby is a call limit standard that identifies at least one of a day, week, or month
11 limit as recited in claim 7.

12 Accordingly, claim 7 is allowable over Norby and the §102 rejection should
13 be withdrawn.

14
15 Claim 11 (as amended) is allowable over Norby for at least any one of the
16 many reasons described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, and
17 Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection of claim 11 be withdrawn.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Claim 21 (as amended) recites a collect callback system comprising a
2 call-in dating service configured to:

3 establish a communication link with a call source that initiates
4 communication with the call-in dating service;

5 initiate a collect callback option for the call source as a form of payment for
6 a duration of a collect call between the call source and the call-in dating service;

7 receive an authorization input for collect call payment from the call source,
8 the collect call being billed to a phone number associated with the call source;

9 communicate callback data to a switch that initiates a collect call via a
10 second communication link to the call source; and

11 receive the collect call for the call source via the second communication
12 link that is routed through the switch.

13 Norby does not show or disclose a collect callback system comprising a
14 call-in dating service, as recited in claim 21. Further, as described above in response
15 to the rejection of claim 1, the configuration and description of the components in
16 Norby do not anticipate each and every element of claim 21 as would be required
17 to substantiate the §102 rejection.

18 Accordingly, claim 21 is allowable over Norby for at least any one or more of
19 the reasons described above in response to the rejection of claim 1, and Applicant
20 respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

21 Independent Claims 41, 52, 57, 64, and 71 are also allowable over Norby for
22 at least any one or more of the reasons described above in response to the rejection of
23 claim 1. The configuration and description of the components in Norby do not
24
25

1 anticipate each and every element of claims 41, 52, 57, 64, and 71 as would be
2 required to substantiate the §102 rejection.

3 Accordingly, each of the independent claims 41, 52, 57, 64, and 71 are
4 allowable over Norby and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be
5 withdrawn.

6
7 Claims 59-63 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 57.
8 Additionally, some or all of claims 59-63 are allowable over Norby for
9 independent reasons. For example:

10 Claim 60 recites that "the automated call-in device is further configured to
11 obtain call source data from a database and utilize the call source data to authorize
12 the collect call for the call source." As described above in response to the
13 rejection of claim 6, Norby does not show or disclose that call source data is
14 obtained and then utilized to authorize a collect call for a call source, as recited in
15 claim 60. Accordingly, claim 60 is allowable over Norby and the §102 rejection
16 should be withdrawn.

17
18 Claims 66-70 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 64.
19 Additionally, some or all of claims 66-70 are allowable over Norby for
20 independent reasons. For example:

21 Claim 68 recites that "the telecommunications switch is further configured
22 to obtain call source data from a database and utilize the call source data to
23 authorize the collect call for the call source." As described above in response to
24 the rejection of claim 6, Norby does not show or disclose that call source data is
25

1 obtained and then utilized to authorize a collect call for a call source, as recited in
2 claim 68. Accordingly, claim 68 is allowable over Norby and the §102 rejection
3 should be withdrawn.

4
5 Claims 73-77 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 71.
6 Additionally, some or all of claims 73-77 are allowable over Norby for
7 independent reasons. For example:

8 Claim 75 recites "obtaining call source data from a database and utilizing
9 the call source data to authorize the collect call for the call source." As described
10 above in response to the rejection of claim 6, Norby does not show or disclose that
11 call source data is obtained and then utilized to authorize a collect call for a call
12 source, as recited in claim 75. Accordingly, claim 75 is allowable over Norby and
13 the §102 rejection should be withdrawn.

14
15 **35 U.S.C. §103 Claim Rejections**

16 **A.** Claims 4, 53, 55-56, 58, 65, and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.
17 §103(a) for obviousness over Norby in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,363,411 to
18 Dugan et al. (hereinafter, "Dugan") (*Office Action* p.5). Applicant respectfully
19 traverses the rejection.

20 **B.** Claims 8-9, 12-15, 17-20, 22, 24-27, 29-30, 32-35, 37-38, 42-44, 46,
21 48-49, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Norby in
22 view of U.S. Patent No. 6,141,405 to Coulter (hereinafter, "Coulter") (*Office*
23 *Action* p.6). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

1 **C.** Claims 10, 16, 28, 36, 45, 50, and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.
2 §103(a) for obviousness over Norby in view of Coulter, and further in view of
3 Dugan (*Office Action* p.9). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

4
5 **A. Claim rejections over the Norby-Dugan combination**

6
7 Claims 4, 53, 55-56, 58, 65, and 72 are each allowable by virtue of their
8 dependency upon respective claims 1, 21, 41, 52, 57, 64, and 71 which are
9 allowable over Norby for at least the reasons described above in response to the
10 §102 rejection of claim 1. Claims 4, 53, 55-56, 58, 65, and 72 are also allowable
11 over the Norby-Dugan combination because Dugan does not address the
12 deficiencies of Norby as described above in the response to the rejection of
13 claim 1. Accordingly, the §103 rejection of claims 4, 53, 55-56, 58, 65, and 72
14 should be withdrawn.

15
16 **B. Claim rejections over the Norby-Coulter combination**

17
18 Claims 8-9 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 1 which
19 is allowable over Norby for at least the reasons described above in response to the
20 §102 rejection of claim 1. Claims 8-9 are also allowable over the Norby-Coulter
21 combination because Coulter does not address the deficiencies of Norby as
22 described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, the §103
23 rejection of claims 8-9 should be withdrawn.

1 Independent Claims 12, 24, 33, 42, and 48 are allowable over Norby for at
2 least any one or more of the reasons described above in response to the §102
3 rejection of claim 1. Further, claims 12, 24, 33, 42, and 48 are allowable over the
4 Norby-Coulter combination because Coulter does not address the deficiencies of
5 Norby as described above in the response to the rejection of claim 1. Accordingly,
6 claims 12, 24, 33, 42, and 48 are allowable over Norby and/or Coulter and
7 Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claims 12, 24, 33, 42, and
8 48 be withdrawn.

9
10 Claim 22 (as amended) recites a collect callback system comprising a
11 switch configured to:

12 receive a call-in service identifier and a call source identifier from a call-in
13 chat service that has initiated a collect callback option for a call source with which
14 the call-in chat service has an established communication link;

15 utilize the call source identifier to initiate a collect call for the call source;

16 communicate an instruction to the call source to verbalize a name to
17 generate a recorded name of the call source;

18 utilize the call-in service identifier to establish the collect call via a second
19 communication link between the call source and the call-in chat service; and

20 generate a recording of at least a portion of the collect call.

21 Norby and/or Coulter do not teach or suggest a collect callback system that
22 includes a call-in dating service, as recited in claim 22. Accordingly, claim 22 is
23 allowable over the Norby-Coulter combination and Applicant respectfully requests
24 that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.
25

1
2 Claims 25-27, 29-30, and 32 are allowable over the Norby-Coulter
3 combination by virtue of their dependency upon allowable claim 24.

4 Claims 34-35 and 37-38 are allowable over the Norby-Coulter combination
5 by virtue of their dependency upon allowable claim 33.

6 Claims 43-44 and 46 are allowable over the Norby-Coulter combination by
7 virtue of their dependency upon allowable claim 42.

8 Claims 49 and 51 are allowable over the Norby-Coulter combination by
9 virtue of their dependency upon allowable claim 48.

10
11 **C. Claim rejections over the Norby-Coulter-Dugan combination**

12
13 Claims 10, 16, 28, 36, 45, 50, and 54 are each allowable by virtue of their
14 dependency upon respective claims 1, 12, 24, 33, 42, 48, and 22 which are
15 allowable over Norby for at least the reasons described above in response to the
16 §102 rejection of claim 1. Claims 10, 16, 28, 36, 45, 50, and 54 are also allowable
17 over the Norby-Coulter-Dugan combination because Coulter and/or Dugan do not
18 address the deficiencies of Norby as described above in the response to the
19 rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, the §103 rejection of claims 10, 16, 28, 36, 45,
20 50, and 54 should be withdrawn.

New Claim

New claim 78 is presented for examination. Based on the above discussion regarding Norby, Dugan, and Coulter, Applicant believes that claim 78 is also allowable. Additionally, claim 78 is allowable by virtue of its dependency upon claim 22, and support for claim 78 can be found in the specification at least at pages 10-12 with reference to Fig. 6.

Conclusion

Pending claims 1-22, 24-30, 32-38, 41-46, and 48-78 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that preclude issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: Nov 4, 2005

By: 

David A. Morasch
Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Reg. No. 42,905
(509) 324-9256 x 210